



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/313,942 05/19/99 STAHL

N REG-203-A

EXAMINER

HM12/0601

JOSEPH M. SORRENTINO, ESQ.
VICE PRESIDENT, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS, INC
777 OLD SAW MILL RIVER ROAD
TARRYTOWN NY 10591

O HARA, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED:

06/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/313,942

Applicant(s)

STAHL ET AL.

Examiner

Eileen B. O'Hara

Art Unit

1646

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eileen B. O'Hara.

(3) Gail Kempler.

(2) Lorraine Spector.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 May 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: PN 5,844,099.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The scope of claim 1 was discussed, in which claim 1 as written could encompass proteins of the prior art, depending on the definition of multimerizing component, the role of which needs to be clarified in the claim. Also, ways to clarify the organization of the different protein encoding components of the nucleic acid in claim 1 was discussed. Also discussed was possible strategies for continuing prosecution of the claimed subject matter.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Eileen B O'Hara 5/3/01

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/313,942

Applicant(s)

STAHL ET AL.

Examiner

Eileen B. O'Hara

Art Unit

1646

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eileen B. O'Hara.

(3) _____.

(2) Gail Kempler.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 08 June 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1-25.

Identification of prior art discussed: PN 5,844,099.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Ms. Kempler was told that the prior art rejection, (PN 5,844,099, which has the same inventors as the current application), could be overcome by filing a CPA and a terminal disclaimer. Filing a CPA and terminal disclaimer would also overcome the double patenting rejection made in the first office action and which would be reinstated in the next office action (in the absence of a terminal disclaimer).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Eileen B. O'Hara 6/8/01
Examiner's signature, if required